with the highest ability to work with superior children.

The Fetsch College is designed to be small, in the sense that the student-teacher ratio will be low. It plans to limit enrollment to 150 to 200 students each year, until the full complement of 1,000 to 1,200 students is reached. It will of course, be an independent, nonprofit, nonsectarian coeducational institution.

Dr. Fetsch says:

The teacher shortage has reached alarming proportions. It is especially difficult to get good teachers who are able to work with gifted young boys and girls. We hope to fill that void.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the aforementioned facts, I urge all of our colleagues in the Congress to get behind the program so ably set forth by Dr. Fetsch and her associates. The opportunities available through the phasing out of the facilities of the U.S. Naval Device Center at Sands Point, Long Island, N.Y., come once in a lifetime. It is only fitting that a part of this land, 65 acres, including the existing administration and engineering buildings, be dedicated to the development of this new Sands Point Fetsch College for Gifted Students.

"THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT: THE PROMISE AND THE PROSPECT," AN ADDRESS BY CONGRESSMAN JOHN BRADEMAS, AT NATIONAL CONVENTION OF THE INTERNATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION, NEW YORK, N.Y., APRIL 14, 1967

(Mr. BRADEMAS (at the request of Mr. CHARLES H. WILSON) was granted permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year I had the pleasure of addressing the national convention of the International Studies Association meeting in New York City. This association is composed primarily of college and university teachers of international affairs and of deans of schools of international studies at colleges and universities.

I insert the text of my address at this point in the RECORD:

THE INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT: THE PROMISE AND THE PROSPECT

I am deeply honored to be here at the eighth annual convention of the International Studies Association.

I want to speak to you this evening about three related topics: the International Education Act and its prospects; government support of private overseas and domestic educational activity; and the formulation of American foreign policy.

Let me begin with a status report on the International Education Act.

I have recently heard the Act described, admittedly by someone less dedicated to it than I, as the teeny-bopper of education. It is, he said, relatively pristine and intact, if not entirely virginal and pure. Full of potential and appeal, one is not quite sure how it will end up if someone doesn't hurry and send it to college!

In my judgment, few Federal programs hold greater promise than the International Education Act for helping American colleges and universities adapt to new conditions and responsibilities. We are familiar with the Morrill Act, which marshalled the resources of higher education with far-reaching effects on the American economy. Legislation creating the National Science Foundation helped bring American science, through government-university cooperation, to the position of pioneering leadership it occupies today. In like fashion, the International Education Act can help colleges and universities transform the international dimension of American higher education and adapt it to the new realities of the latter third of the Twentieth Century.

But we have a long road to travel before we can provide a truly international education for all Americans.

As you know, Congress last year passed the enabling legislation but failed to provide any money to carry out its mandate. The 90th Congress is now three months old and it has yet to provide a single penny of direct support for either planning or grants under the IEA.

I must warn you that my colleagues on the House and Senate Appropriations Committees might just decide not to provide any funds for this fiscal year—or the next fiscal year either. The Viet Nam budget squeeze coupled with the more conservative complexion of this Congress may leave the Act an empty shell.

Dr. Paul Miller, Assistant Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare—the Department with responsibility for administering the IEA—recently testified before the House Appropriations Committee, where he ably argued the case for the $350,000 supplemental appropriation for this fiscal year for planning purposes. These funds are requested for the operation of the National Advisory Council on International Studies and the establishment of the Center for Educational Cooperation in HEW. He also testified before the Senate Appropriations Committee on the fiscal 1968 request of $36.5 million. This amount would provide almost 19 million dollars for grants to colleges and universities to establish graduate centers of excellence and for the development of comprehensive programs of international studies at the undergraduate level.

DANGER OF LACK OF FUNDS

In the best of all possible worlds, the case for the IEA would stand or fall—and I firmly believe it would stand—on the persuasive arguments developed by Dr. Miller in his testimony and on the force of the hearings, reports and floor debates over the Act itself. But the likelihood is that without increased support from the academic community all the effort to date will have been wasted for lack of funds. In short, the success or failure of the Act is in large measure up to men and women like you.

Although HEW is without funds for a fully staffed planning effort, some persons drawn from the academic community and private educational organizations are making a significant effort to work with Paul Miller and his colleagues to determine the wisest pattern of investing what will clearly be limited grant monies. I understand that some 25 or 30 special papers are being written and discussed within the academic community, a process which should give this planning a genuine push forward.

The International Education Act, as you may recall, specifies that the Secretary of Health, Education and Welfare must report to Congress on plans and recommendations for implementation of the program prior to full funding. Failure to win an appropriation last year has caused postponement of the report from the original April 30 deadline, but I am told that we can expect to have it in hand before the end of this fiscal year. The report will be an important milestone in bringing the full force of the program into play and I, for one, look forward eagerly to reading its recommendations.

Let me make a comment on the present situation from the vantage point of a practicing politician deeply concerned about the development of this program.

CAREFUL PLANNING WISE

The IEA holds forth great promise for all American colleges and universities.

At the same time, its immediate potential is far more limited. First, as I have already indicated, money is tight in Washington as well as on Wall Street. Even if funds were more abundant than they are, the need for rational, careful planning and the development of a national strategy for international education would dictate a moderate beginning and a more rapid build-up after the strategy emerges, is tested and modified by experience. This cautious pace, forced upon us by circumstance, can provide us with valuable time.

Limited funds will of course mean that many deserving institutions will miss out on the first round.

There are two points I want to stress in this connection. First, I believe that in the early years of the IEA program, it would be desirable to concentrate a healthy portion of the available funds on support to institutions which have taken at least the preliminary steps toward adding a significant international dimension to their faculty, curriculum and research. By this I do not mean "making the rich richer", or concentrating the funds available on a handful of prestigious universities and showcase liberal arts colleges. I cannot help feeling that those colleges and universities which have already demonstrated a sound commitment to developing their own international dimension, through the concentration of *their own resources* and leadership, may have some right to stand near the head of the line. And I hasten to point out that the record of some small and relatively poor independent colleges in this respect puts to shame a few of our biggest universities.

Second, I believe the limited funds available under the IEA make it all the more important that the institutions receiving grants in the early years of the Act make a systematic effort to evaluate their experience, both before and during the period when they receive support under the IEA. The ideas and insights derived from their experience may provide guidance both for their fellow institutions and for the administrators of the Act.

The modest beginning—and the potentially rice future—call for foresight and statesmanship on the part of *all* institutions of higher education. Cooperative ventures, clearly encouraged by the legislation, can maximize the value of limited funds.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT A DOMESTIC MEASURE

I now want to consider with you the related area of government support for private educational and other activity overseas. We must keep clearly in mind, however, that the International Education Act as conceived and enacted is a domestic measure, designed to strengthen American colleges and universities. It was not intended to support substantial overseas activity that was not part of a graduate or undergraduate program in international studies at an American institution of higher education.

Let me here take note of *Ramparts* magazine and its gadfly effort to track down the CIA, wherever the agency may venture. The recent disclosures of the farflung covert support by the CIA of a wide variety of private organizations, some of them educational, raise in a sharp relief a series of issues for higher education, particularly in international studies and research.

Before turning to specifics, let me make clear that I do not for a moment think that more than a miniscule number of educational institutions have participated in covert activities similar to the CIA–NSA relationship. My criticisms, warnings and rec-

CIA 2.04.2 Students

commendations must be understood in the light of that perception.

RUSK AND KATZENBACH COMMITTEES

I want to speak briefly, first of the two Presidential committees, the Katzenbach and Rusk groups, appointed to deal with the problem raised by the CIA issue, and then of the challenge faced by the Rusk Committee, and what all this means for the International Education Act.

As you know, the Katzenbach Committee—composed of the former Attorney General, the Secretary of HEW and the Director of the CIA—made two recommendations:

First, that the Federal government should no longer "provide any covert assistance or support, either direct or indirect, to any of the nation's educational or private voluntary organizations." President Johnson has accepted this recommendation, which is tantamount to an Executive Order to discontinue such activity.

Second, that President Johnson appoint a committee to "establish a public-private mechanism to provide funds for overseas activities which are judged deserving, in the national interest, of public support."

It is difficult to take serious issue with these recommendations as far as they go. One must assume in good faith that their careful wording is not designed to create technical loopholes for future hidden support or persuasion. In this regard, I share the sentiment expressed editorially by the *Washington Post* that the recommendation by the Katzenbach Committee of an exception for cases where the national security is involved is indeed "disquieting." The precise genesis of the present controversy, after all, is that one man's definition of "national security" is another man's view of unwarranted government intrusion and influence in the private sector.

To meet the second recommendation, President Johnson has appointed a committee, chaired by Secretary of State Rusk, members of the Executive, Members of Congress and men from various walks of private life. The education sector outside government is well represented by such men as Herman Wells from my own state of Indiana. Yet the obvious lack of a representative from either the Senate or House education committees is puzzling in view of the close relationship among the education committee, government policy and the health and integrity of our own educational institutions.

The Katzenbach report made only a brief, though plausible, argument for the need of continuing support with public funds of some overseas activities of private groups. The report did not shed much light on the general nature of the subsidized activities nor upon their relevance to American foreign policy. Many Congressmen, in my judgment, would feel considerably more confidence in their ability to legislate effectively in this area if we had a good deal more information on what has been the substance of the activities carried on by the organizations subsidized by the CIA. I am not talking about lurid exposes nor minutely detailed accounts that would compromise individuals or organizations.

For example, a covertly CIA subsidized program for training Latin American journalists might not seem to Congress a wise instrument of anti-communist foreign policy but might be justifiable as an open facet of what we now comprehend as the "human resource development" component of our effort to help developing nations. Maybe so, maybe not. I fail to see however how I—and other Members of Congress—can make up our minds if we do not know with greater precision what has been going on. The Rusk Committee could render a substantial service by reporting the facts more fully.

In addition, the newspapers and magazines, which gave such extensive disclosures to when they were front page news, could help fill a gap in the knowledge of legislators and the public at large by following their excellent reporting with some analysis of the kinds of activities which received support.

Previous disclosures of CIA activity have, of course, already had an effect on Congressional attitudes toward the International Education Act. The law and its legislative history contain, in large measure due to the wise insistence of Senator Wayne Morse, both strong prohibitious against government interference with the scholarly programs it supports. Also included in the law is a specific requirement that any cooperative arrangement which involves a governmental agency other than the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare must be fully published in advance in the Federal Register. Although this approach is not without problems, the provision serves as clear notice that IEA programs are off limits to any agency seeking to channel covert support to or through institutions of higher education.

INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION ACT ADMINISTERED BY DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Indeed, the Act serves as a strong barrier to possible encroachments on the academic freedoms of open inquiry, debate and publication. Congress insisted that the IEA be administered by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare—the Cabinet Department with primary responsibility for education. Congress did not assign responsibility for administration of this act to the Department of State, the Department of Defense, and certainly not to the CIA!

As the Senate Committee report on the bill stated: ". . . the primary goal of this legislation is building, in this country, a strong base of international studies at the graduate level and, on the undergraduate level, giving a wide segment of our students a chance to learn more about the world and the customs and values of other countries."

I note that several Members of Congress and Senators have expressed an interest in or actually introduced legislation designed to make the IEA a vehicle for supporting the overseas educational activities of private groups. I would oppose these well-intentioned amendments for several reasons.

I have already alluded to the political difficulties which we face in obtaining an appropriation. By diluting the domestic focus of the Act, the difficulties would only be compounded. It is fair to say that some Members of Congress oppose the measure because they still mistakenly believe it to be a new source of educational foreign aid, and they therefore would certainly not condone such a program at a time when established and popular domestic legislation faces severe financial difficulties. Furthermore, the problems of administering this program are difficult enough without the complications attendant on financing the overseas activities of private groups.

The Fascell subcommittee of the Foreign Affairs Committee, in fact, will begin hearings on one measure to create a private-public corporation next week. This measure does not tie the new mechanism to the IEA.

I hope I have made it very clear that I regard the work of the Rusk Committee as vitally important. I have followed closely the public discussion of possible ways in which we may deal with the basic issues spotlighted by the CIA-NSA and related revelations.

SOME RECOMMENDATIONS

My attention, like yours I am sure, has been drawn particularly to the question of how we as a nation can proceed in establishing new mechanisms, or expanding existing ones, to serve the required purposes. Tonight I would like, as a working congressman and as a citizen deeply concerned about the integrity of our educational institutions, to offer a few thoughts on this important issue.

I have no specific recommendations to offer at this point on the instrumentality or instrumentalities which we might develop. I do believe that in large measure "form must follow function", and that the crucial function served by an entity which evolves or is created is that of administering appropriated Federal funds under *both substantial* and *apparent* private control. Private control must be substantial for the plan to work. It must be apparent in order to convince.

From the perspective of a congressman, that is, I see the basic dilemma as that of private control versus public accountability and legislative oversight. Many people both inside and outside government, for instance, have suggested as useful parallels the National Science Foundation or the National Institutes of Health. They point out that these are actual agencies of government. The NSF is an independent agency whose Director reports to the President of the United States; the NIH is an integral part of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. The grant-making activities of both NSF and NIH are carried out under very substantial private oversight or control through the mechanism of advisory panels. These panels are composed entirely or predominantly of private citizens, whose recommendations both on broad policy questions and on the merits of individual grant applications are accorded the heaviest possible weight by the agency.

The NSF and NIH present appealing analogues, and I might say parenthetically that I hope their experience in utilizing expertise from the private academic and intellectual community will be drawn upon heavily by HEW and the Center for Educational Cooperation in the administration of the International Education Act. Yet the analogies are not exact for both NSF and NIH possess built-in advantages which we cannot assume will be inherent in our present area of interest, that is the role played by the United States in the world community of educational intellectual and cultural endeavor. First, the activities supported by NIH and NSF are clearly important to every Congressman and to his constituents. Second, the activities supported are generally those which the great majority of Congressmen have decided are too complex for them to master in terms of significant detailed understanding. They are areas in which Congress has long since accepted the necessity of relying heavily on the counsel of experts, many of whom are in private life.

We are faced, therefore, with the prospect of considerable difficulty in achieving the degree of private control which exists at NSF and NIH. I would suggest further that the functions we are speaking of might best not be carried on within a government agency at all, for the simple reason that the more directly any proposed entity is connected with the formal structure of our government, the less acceptable will be its activities or indirect presence overseas. To use my earlier phrase, the private control might be *substantial*—but to a foreigner, at least, I doubt that it would be *apparent*.

A NEW MECHANISM?

How, then, do we proceed? First, I think it fair to assume that there is a genuine desire to carry on a number of facets of our intellectual and educational interaction with the rest of the world under truly private auspices and control and that this sense is shared by responsible leadership in both parties and both Houses of the Congress.

Second, if this awareness does exist—and I believe it does—we ought to be able to design an instrumentality under both genuine and apparent private control which will operate in such a way that our national legislators will believe themselves justified, in terms both of their personal convictions and of their relationship with their constitu-

encies, in committing reasonable amounts of public funds to activities some of which may be controversial and all of which will be carried on somewhat outside the usual structures of Congressional control.

But there are other aspects of this problem I want to discuss. First, I doubt the suitability of any eixsting organization, public or private, to carry on the full spectrum of activities which might be carried out by a new institution. Whatever the mechanism, it should probably be able to make grants to private organizations concerned with a much broader range of activities than those related to what we might call the CIA legacy. The new mechanism ought also to be able itself to carry on certain overseas activities where appropriate. More important, the new entity should be authorized and equipped to examine and assess the ways in which our own society and its institutions can participate in international activities with their foreign counterparts.

My own feeling, as of now, is that we are faced with the necessity of creating something new under the sun. The private control versus public accountability dilemma might best be solved by having a basically private organization with a Federal charter; some of the obvious analogues here are the Smithsonian Institution, the American National Red Cross, and the National Academy of Sciences. We should consider the possibility that the basic legislation for this institution would contain a permanent authorization for the appropriation of Federal funds, much as NSF now enjoys.

Yet legal structure alone will not suffice to resolve the public-private dilemma, either as viewed by Congress or from abroad. The crucial factor, in my mind, is the selection of a highly distinguished Board of Regents or Trustees—numbering among its membership representatives from the Executive Branch and from both houses of Congress, perhaps, but with private citizens in the clear majority, and with policy control effectively in their hands. If membership on this Board could involve a sufficiently challenging intellectual experience, quite aside from any honorific aspects, the very best men in our society would be eager to serve on it and to become committed to its work and to guiding its operations. We might then have taken a long step toward resolving the public-private dilemma.

SOME AREAS OF POTENTIAL CONDUCT

Assuming for the moment that the new entity were formed along the lines I have tentatively suggested, there are at least three major areas of potential jurisdictional conflicts with other agencies. I think first of the Center for Educational Cooperation within HEW, with its dual responsibilities for administering grant programs relating to U.S. colleges and universities and carrying on direct program activities. I cite second, existing grant-making and other activities related to international educational and cultural cooperation now lodged within the Department of State, AID and USIA.

I list third, the whole area of research in or on foreign areas and international affairs, particularly where government support is involved. Each of these areas of existing activity presents problems and opportunities for any new organization.

With regard to its relation to the Center of Educational Cooperation and the IEA, I have indicated that I think the Act should not be turned into a vehicle either for educational foreign aid overseas or for the kinds of activities formerly supported covertly by the CIA. A new entity, however, would be more concerned with the overseas operations of private American institutions and organizations than with strengthening American colleges and universities.

On the second point, it might be useful to consider the new institution as an eventual home for some of our existing government international education or cultural activities, precisely because the agencies presently involved are inevitably instruments of our government's foreign policy. Yet such an approach is by no means central to the immediate concerns of the Rusk Committee.

The third area is research. Some consideration may well be given to lodging substantial research funding capacity in a new organization in order to remove any stigma attached to government support of research in foreign countries. In my judgment, such a role should be assigned only with great caution. An artificial dissociation of foreign area research activities from domestic research in general, or from the process of foreign policy formulation or—in the overseas setting—from the problems of strengthening the resources and institutions of other nations might well produce more harm than good.

I have given the briefest attention to each of these areas, not merely because time presses, but because I believe they are complex, important and largely unsolved issues. I hope that they are very much on the minds of the Rusk Committee and its staff.

GOVERNMENT AND EDUCATION

Before closing this evening, I want to touch briefly upon two areas of general and far-reaching concern. They encompass several crucial issues broached by the CIA–NSA disclosures, although by no means all of them, and they are fundamental to understanding the long-term importance of the International Education Act.

Coming not long after the Michigan State and Project Camelot disclosures, the most recent revelations of covert government involvement in educational activities have tarnished the reputation for integrity of an unfortunately wide range of institutions. James Reston wrote earlier this year that the opening weeks of 1967 "have been hard on the capital of the United States because they have shaken its confidence in itself." They have "produced", he accurately reported, "not only policy doubt but moral doubt, and even self-doubt."

Or, as one NSA member who was not "witting", that is did not know of the CIA subsidy, remarked to me: "I'll believe anything now. It's all done with mirrors."

Justified or unjustified, the activities of the nation's intelligence gathering agencies have led to a sometimes quiet, sometimes not so quiet, crisis of confidence in the degree to which the free flow of ideas among students, educational institutions and other organizations have been tainted by undisclosed interests. At worst, there is deep cynicism and speculation that the government is intentionally exercising considerable and undue influence upon educational organizations, including colleges and universities. And, I might add, the cynics condemn the institutions for being willing partners in the subterfuge.

I am sympathetic to what Senator J. William Fulbright wrote recently on the relationship of government and the universities. He wrote:

"Whatever the circumstances of the moment, whatever the demands of government and industry on the universities—and whatever the rewards for meeting those demands—the highest function of higher education is what might be called the teachings of things in perspective, toward the purpose of enriching the life of the individual, cultivating the free and inquiring mind, and advancing the effort to bring reason, justice, and humanity into the relations of men and nations—Only insofar as the university is a place where ideas are valued above their practical application, in which there is a greater interest in contributing to the sum of human knowledge than in helping a government agency to resolve some practical problem, is the university meeting its academic responsibility to the students and its patriotic responsibility to the country."

I do not mean, of course, that universities cannot or should not help societies in general and government in particular solve problems. Indeed, most of our colleges and universities receive from Federal and State governments a good part of the financial resources they must have to operate. Education makes substantial claims upon our limited resources and it too must stand the tests of priority with other public endeavors. Yet to say that education must make its claim along with other institutions for a share of limited funds gives no government agency—State, local or Federal—any mandate to twist or distort the process of education.

In the critical field of international studies, scholarship lies perilously close to immediate, practical and pivotal policy concerns. The potential advantages to be gained from manipulation may often appear great. The opportunity to mobilize forces of intelligence and persuasion behind the shield of apparently legitimate, disinterested study and exchange of ideas has evidently proved difficult to resist.

Yet it is equally clear that in the vital fields of international affairs, where the stakes are so high and the temptations so alluring, we must erase even the slightest cause for suspicion that education and research in international studies are not what they seem.

FORMULATION OF FOREIGN POLICY IN A FREE SOCIETY

The International Education Act, as I have already suggested, can play an important role in providing the needed assurance.

The International Education Act also has important long-term implications for the formulation of foreign policy in a free and open society such as ours.

Foreign policy is no longer conducted simply from government to government. Rather it is a continuing day-to-day process carried on by hundreds of institutions, public and private, and thousands of individuals scattered all over the globe. American students in Paris, large corporations in Latin America, voluntary associations working in underdeveloped countries—all are daily shaping the contours of our relationship to the rest of the world.

This wide variety of activity is likely to expand as communications and transportation become faster and cheaper.

This proliferation of active players in the drama of foreign policy requires a significant degree of sophistication and knowledge about the other countries of the world, particularly the non-Western world. There is, of course, no substitute for actual experience with foreign cultures, but education from the earliest years—and particularly at the college and university level—must prepare Americans for their new roles in world affairs.

In addition to this new dimension of foreign policy, in a democratic society such as ours the formulation of foreign policy—the development and comprehension of purposes and alternatives—demands special attention.

The recent revelations about the clandestine activities of the CIA, for example, are disturbing partly because they have cast a shadow on the integrity of respected educational and other institutions. But the covert support is also disturbing because it is an unfortunate chapter in a long history of inadequate dialogue between the government and the informed, interested citizen on foreign policy matters. The reluctance of the CIA and other top officials to make a case for supporting the overseas activities of private groups is indicative of a feeling of wariness on the part of appointed officials—sometimes quite justified, I admit—of the ability and desire of elected officials and interested segments of the population to appreciate the complexities and